

TESTING THE RELATION BETWEEN THE LOCAL AND COSMIC STAR FORMATION HISTORIES

Brian D. Fields

School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA
fields@mnhepw.hep.umn.edu

ABSTRACT

Recently, there has been great progress toward observationally determining the mean star formation history of the universe. When accurately known, the cosmic star formation rate could provide much information about Galactic evolution, if the Milky Way's star formation rate is representative of the average cosmic star formation history. A simple hypothesis is that our local star formation rate is proportional to the cosmic mean. In addition, to specify a star formation history, one must also adopt an initial mass function (IMF); typically it is assumed that the IMF is a smooth function which is constant in time. We show how to test directly the compatibility of all these assumptions, by making use of the local (solar neighborhood) star formation record encoded in the present-day stellar mass function. Present data suggests that at least one of the following is false: (1) the local IMF is constant in time; (2) the local IMF is a smooth (unimodal) function; and/or (3) star formation in the Galactic disk was representative of the cosmic mean. We briefly discuss how to determine which of these assumptions fail, and improvements in observations which will sharpen this test.

Subject headings: Galaxy: evolution — cosmology: observations

1. Introduction

The cosmic star formation history has recently begun to be unveiled and pushed to increasingly high redshift (Gallego et al. 1995; Lilly et al. 1996; Madau et al. 1996; Madau 1997a, 1997b; Connolly et al. 1997; Pettini et al. 1997; Tresse & Maddox 1997). Current results suggest a sharp rise to a peak at redshifts $z \sim 1 - 3$, though the behavior at $z \gtrsim 1$ depends strongly on models of absorption at these epochs (see §3). In addition to their cosmological importance, these data are potentially useful for understanding the evolution of our own Galaxy, if the Milky Way's star

formation history has been typical. Knowledge of the past Galactic star formation rate would significantly reduce uncertainties and *ad hoc* assumptions in chemical evolution calculations.

Thus, we wish to consider the connection between the cosmic star formation rate (CSFR) and the local (i.e., solar neighborhood) star formation rate (LSFR). In particular, we will test the hypothesis that the cosmic and local star formation rates are simply related. The simplest ansatz is that the two rates are proportional to one another; we will refer to this as the hypothesis of “star formation universality.” Whether the Galaxy’s evolution was representative—i.e., followed the cosmic mean—is not certain. On the one hand, the Milky Way appears to be typical in many respects, with a common morphology and a luminosity $\sim L_*$ near the local, low- z average. On the other hand, it is certain that in some systems, star formation can and does proceed differently from the cosmic mean. For example, starburst galaxies and extragalactic HII regions show highly elevated star formation rates that cannot be maintained smoothly over cosmic timescales. Also, a hierarchical clustering scheme of structure formation predicts that smaller objects form first and later merge to make large galaxies such as our own, with star formation commencing in protogalaxies at redshifts $\simeq 3.5$ (Baugh, Cole, Frenk, & Lacey 1998).

In testing for star formation universality, an additional complication comes into play: to fully specify a star formation history requires not only a star formation rate, but also an initial mass function (IMF). Indeed, the IMF and the LSFR are closely entangled—it is difficult to determine the IMF over all of the observed stellar mass range without some knowledge the star formation history. Nevertheless, it is typically assumed (with support from observations: Wyse 1998; Hillenbrand 1997) that the IMF is constant in time, and “smoothly varying”—i.e., unimodal in shape; this form has some support from theory (e.g., Adams & Fatuzzo 1996; Silk 1995; Ferrini, Palla, & Penco 1990). On the other hand, some models have adopted bimodal star formation (e.g., Larson 1986; Gusten & Mezger 1982; Wyse & Silk 1987), motivated in part by evidence that high- and low-mass star formation in molecular clouds does occur in spatially separated regions (Herbig 1962). It is not clear, however, whether this local spatial variation leads to bimodality in the global, ensemble averaged IMF. For example, Ferrini, Palla, & Penco (1990) present a fragmentation theory for star formation in which the mass distribution varies according to the local properties of the molecular cloud, but the global superposition of these distributions leads to a fairly smooth and unimodal IMF. Given this theoretical uncertainty, model-builders have for the most part adopted an IMF which is a single power law, or broken power law sometimes approximated as a lognormal.

In this paper, we will examine the implications of star formation universality by combining the most common assumptions about the Galactic IMF. The compatibility of these assumptions is testable via the present day mass function (PDMF), i.e., the local (solar neighborhood) stellar luminosity function, converted to a distribution in mass. The PDMF which contains information about the IMF as well as the LSFR over a wide range of epochs. It is important thus to note that by using the PDMF for our comparison of local versus cosmic star formation, we take “local” star formation to mean that in the *solar neighborhood*, where the PDMF is observed. We thus can at

best hope that the PDMF samples the disk star forming history, and we must remember that we have not included the history of the stellar halo.

In our test of star formation universality, we use the observed PDMF to infer the needed IMF, whose smoothness (unimodality) we examine. We also go the other direction, computing the expected PDMF for typical IMF choices, and comparing this with the data. In both cases, we find that the data suggest that our Galaxy cannot have both typical evolution and a time-independent, smooth IMF.

We present the needed formalism in §2, and summarize the relevant data in §3. We calculate the PDMF–IMF transformations in §4, and in §5 discuss the possible differences between local, Galactic, and cosmic star formation histories. The implications of our results are explored in §6.

2. Formalism

The fundamental object quantifying star formation history (Salpeter 1955; Tinsley 1980) is the stellar creation function $C(m, t)$. This measures the number $N_\star$ of stars born in mass range $(m, m + dm)$ and time interval $(t, t + dt)$, and is defined by

$$dN_\star = C(m, t) dm dt \quad (1)$$

$$\stackrel{\text{sep}}{=} \phi(m) \psi(t) dm dt \quad (2)$$

For local (i.e., solar neighborhood) stars, $N_\star$ is usually expressed a column density, averaged over disk scale height, of newborn stars. The creation function is often assumed to be *separable*, i.e., in the form of eq. (2), where the IMF is ϕ , and the LSFR is ψ . The units for the IMF and LSFR depend on the normalization of ϕ ; for the customary choice of $\int dm m \phi(m) = 1$ (which we will adopt), $[\psi] = M_\odot \text{pc}^{-2} \text{Gyr}^{-1}$. For a thorough review of the creation function and the IMF, see Scalo (1986).

Adopting a separable creation function is equivalent to assuming the IMF is constant in time. Clearly, this is a very strong assumption, one that greatly reduces the large freedom available in a general creation function. Nevertheless, model-builders have, whenever possible, made this ansatz on the basis of simplicity. In this paper, we will adopt separability as well, including it among the basic assumptions whose compatibility we wish to test.

The data we will use to test star formation histories is the disk present day mass function, which quantifies the mass distribution of main-sequence stars burning in the disk today. Observationally, the PDMF is derived from the luminosity function of solar neighborhood, main-sequence stars, via a translation to a mass function via a mass–luminosity relation. Theoretically, the PDMF can be derived in full generality from eq. (1). One of two expressions is appropriate, depending on the main sequence mass m and its associated lifetime $\tau(m)$. The two cases are divided at the present-day main sequence turnoff mass m_0 , defined by $\tau(m_0) \equiv t_0$, where

t_0 is the present age of the universe.¹ Specifically, we have

$$\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m) = \begin{cases} \int_0^{t_0} dt' C(m, t') & m < m_0 \\ \int_{t_0 - \tau(m)}^{t_0} dt' C(m, t') & m \geq m_0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Note that, for a known creation function C , the PDMF is completely determined. Equation (3) is thus fundamentally simpler than, e.g., the usual integro-differential expressions for mass or abundance consumption in chemical evolution. The simplicity of the connection between the star formation history C and the (observable) PDMF is one of the strengths of the present analysis.

In our case of a separable creation function, eq. (3) specializes to

$$\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m) = \begin{cases} \Sigma_{\star}(t_0) \phi(m) & m < m_0 \\ (\Sigma_{\star}(t_0) - \Sigma_{\star}[t_0 - \tau(m)]) \phi(m) & m \geq m_0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The quantity

$$\Sigma_{\star}(t) \equiv \int_0^t dt' \psi(t') \quad (5)$$

is the aggregate mass (per square parsec) ever going into stars by time t , including material that went into now-dead stars. In physical terms, eq. (4) states that at a given mass, the PDMF is given by the product of the IMF at that mass, times the integrated star formation over the stellar lifetime at that mass, or the age of the Galaxy, whichever is smaller. Note that the PDMF has units $[\Phi_{\text{MS}}] = \text{stars pc}^{-2} M_{\odot}^{-1}$. The observed PDMF of Scalo (1986) appears as the filled points in Figures 4 and 5.

As is well-known, Φ_{MS} simplifies in two limits. For high masses ($m \gtrsim 4 - 5 M_{\odot}$), the lifetimes are short enough ($\tau(m) \ll t_0$), that one essentially samples only the present LSFR:

$$\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m) \approx \phi(m) \tau(m) \psi(t_0) \quad (6)$$

Since $\tau(m)$ is known theoretically to fairly good accuracy, the shape of $\phi(m)$ is easily inferred from Φ_{MS} in this mass range. The PDMF also simplifies at low masses. For a present age $t_0 = 13$ Gyr (15 Gyr), the turnoff is at $m_0 = 0.91 M_{\odot}$ ($0.87 M_{\odot}$). At low masses $m < m_0$, we have $\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m, t_0) = \Sigma_{\star}(t_0) \phi(m)$. Again, in this range, the PDMF gives the shape of the IMF, though here the scaling is different than for high masses, now depending on the aggregate star formation (or, equivalently, the time averaged star formation). Indeed, the usual procedure for deriving the IMF from the PDMF is to smoothly match the IMF derived from high and low mass limits (for an assumed Galactic star formation rate). The matching gives the ratio $\tau_{\star} = \Sigma_{\star}/\psi$, a measure of the timescale for star formation.

Clearly, the PDMF directly expresses information about star formation history as encoded in both the IMF and LSFR. Unfortunately, the relation is not a uniquely invertible one: the PDMF

¹Strictly speaking, one should use $\tau(m_0) = t_{\text{disk}}$, the age of the disk, but in practice the difference is relevant for a very narrow range of masses only; see the discussion in §5.

can be consistent with many putative star formation histories, even in the case of a separable creation function. However, the PDMF is certainly *not* consistent with *all* possible histories. As first noted by Salpeter (1955), and emphasized by Scalo (1986), one must show that any choice of IMF and LSFR are *compatible*; indeed tests of IMF–PDMF compatibility have become commonplace features of chemical evolution studies (as reviewed in e.g., Tinsley 1980; Shore & Ferrini 1985; or Pagel 1997). One approach to testing the PDMF—star formation history compatibility is to adopt both a LSFR and an IMF, and to those that these are able to reproduce the PDMF via eq. (4). Alternatively, one can choose to adopt either an IMF or a LSFR, and via eq. (4) use the PDMF to deduce the other function; this has been done with particular care in Mathews, Bazan, & Cowan (1992). In this paper we will use both procedures to address the compatibility of typical assumptions about the IMF with the emerging data on the cosmic star formation rate, as described in the following section.

3. The Cosmic Star Formation Rate

The CSFR, which we will denote $\dot{\rho}_\star$, is the average cosmic rate at which mass goes into stars per unit comoving volume. It is obtained via analysis of the galactic luminosity function at various epochs and over a range of (comoving) wavelengths. Of particular interest is the redshift history of the integrated galactic emission from hot, short-lived stars, either from the H α line, or from the UV continuum. Because essentially all H α or UV comes from these massive stars, it follows that the luminosity density at these wavelengths (when corrected for absorption) is proportional to the instantaneous CSFR (e.g., Kennicutt 1983; Madau et al. 1996). Strictly speaking, the UV or H α luminosity traces only the *massive* star formation, but if the IMF is time-independent as we assume, then the massive star formation rate differs from the total star formation rate by just a constant factor.

Furthermore, the *shape* of the CSFR inferred from massive star luminosity is independent of the cosmic IMF; this follows because there is, for any reasonable IMF, only a very small contribution to these wavelengths from lower mass, longer lived stars. However, the *normalization* of the CSFR does depend on the IMF, which quantifies the fraction of all stars which are massive. Fortunately, we will only need the shape of the CSFR, as we only wish to test the ansatz that $\psi \propto \dot{\rho}_\star$.

For $z \lesssim 1$, Lilly et al. (1996) used the Canada-France-Hawaii survey data to compute the evolution of the comoving UV luminosity density at $\lambda = 2800 \text{ \AA}$, $\mathcal{L}_{2800}$, which implies

$$\dot{\rho}_\star(z) \propto \mathcal{L}_{2800}(z) \propto (1+z)^{3.9 \pm 0.75}, \quad \text{for } z \lesssim 1 \quad (7)$$

(throughout, densities are expressed in comoving units). For comparison, Gallego et al. (1995) and Tresse & Maddox (1997) use H α luminosity as a massive star formation indicator. Tresse & Maddox thereby find a somewhat higher increase with redshift: $\dot{\rho}_\star(z) \propto \mathcal{L}_{\text{H}\alpha} \propto (1+z)^{4.4}$.

For redshifts $z > 1$, analysis of the Hubble Deep Field (Madau et al. 1996; Madau 1997a, 1997b, Connolly, Szalay, Dickinson, SubbaRao, & Brunner 1997) suggest a peak in the $z = 1 - 2$ interval, and then (in the case of constant extinction) a dropoff by $z \sim 4$ to values close to those at $z = 0$. However, these results depend strongly on the absorption of the UV light as it travels to us and is redshifted; it has been suggested that dust extinction at high redshifts could require upward corrections in the CSFR by factors of 3 (Pettini et al. 1997) or even more (Meurer et al. 1995).

Madau et al. (1996) were the first to use the “UV dropout” analysis of the Hubble Deep Field to construct a cosmic star formation history. In an attempt to span the different possibilities for cosmic absorption, Madau et al., and later Madau (1997a, 1997b), examine two models for extinction, motivated by two galaxy formation scenarios. (1) Madau’s fiducial model assumes dust extinction does not evolve with redshift, and takes the form of an SMC extinction law: $E_{B-V}(z) = \text{const} = 0.06$ mag. As the extinction is not a function of time or redshift, this model does not give a strong correction to the rest-frame UV light to infer the CSFR at early epochs. (2) To try to bracket the effect of extinction on masking star formation, Madau also presents a model in which it is assumed that the star formation is large at $z > 1$, but that half of all stars born are shrouded in dust. This model has extinction which increases with redshift: $E_{B-V}(z) = 0.0067(1+z)^{2.2}$ mag; it thus leads to much larger CSFR at high redshift than does the fiducial, constant E_{B-V} model. The CSFRs derived from each method (denoted the “constant” and “evolving” E_{B-V} models) appear in the insets to the Figures. We will use both models in our analysis.

Note the different units in the local and cosmic star formation rates, of area and volume densities, respectively. Physically, this comes about since the local, disk data averages over scale heights, whereas the cosmic rate averages over all comoving star forming material. The different units point up the assumptions made in assuming that the LSFR and CSFR are proportional. Namely, (1) disk scale height has not changed over the disk lifetime, and (2) external perturbations to our own disk star formation (e.g., merging or infall) are typical of the average galaxy.

Note also that the CSFR results depend on adopted cosmology, which gives the age of universe t_0 , and supplies the $t - z$ relation needed to convert CSFR information known as a function of redshift. In this paper, we use $H_0 = 50 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, and an $\Omega_0 = 1$ Einstein-de Sitter universe with no cosmological constant; this gives $t_0 = 13$ Gyr.

4. PDMF Tests of Star Formation Universality

With the CSFR data, and some general assumptions about the IMF, we may now use eq. (4). to test star formation universality, i.e., whether cosmic star formation and local star formation are proportional. Other chemical evolution tests are possible, but these also involve IMF assumptions and perhaps other stellar model uncertainties too, e.g., yields. Here the assumptions are fewer and

more explicit.

As discussed in the previous section, the CSFR becomes uncertain around $z_{\max} \sim 1$, due to poorly known extinction at high redshift; this epoch occurs at $t_{\min} \sim 5$ Gyr for our adopted cosmology. The associated lookback time $t_{\text{look}} = t_0 - t_{\max} \sim 8$ Gyr corresponds to the lifetime of a star of mass $m_{\min} \simeq 1.1M_{\odot}$. Fortunately, there is only small gap between this and the turnoff mass $m_0 \simeq 0.9M_{\odot}$. Thus we can reliably reconstruct the PDMF down to $m_{\min}$, but below this mass, uncertainty accumulates due to the poorly known high-redshift CSFR. It is worth noting that estimates of disk age give about $\tau_{\text{disk}} \sim 10$ Gyr, i.e., a disk birth at $t_0 - \tau_{\text{disk}} = 3$ Gyr, which is of order $t_{\min}$. Thus, where the CSFR data becomes less certain, we also expect some halo contribution to the CSFR, and for the physics of disk formation to become a potential complication (see §5).

As discussed in §2, adopting a particular star formation rate uniquely determines the IMF (in the context of a separable creation function) by inverting eq. (4) via

$$\phi(m) \propto \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m)}{\Sigma_{\star}(t_0)} & m < m_0 \\ \frac{\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m)}{\Sigma_{\star}(t_0) - \Sigma_{\star}[t_0 - \tau(m)]} & m \geq m_0 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Figure 1 plots the IMFs that result from the Madau fiducial, “constant E_{B-V} ” CSFR. We see that the IMF is bimodal, with distinct peaks at $m \sim 0.2M_{\odot}$ and $m \sim 1.3M_{\odot}$. This appearance of multiple peaks arises due to the strong rise of the CSFR back towards early epochs. That is, since ϕ varies inversely with the integrated star formation according to eq. (8), the long-lived, low mass end of the IMF is suppressed relative to the high mass end. This correction, superimposed upon the singled peaked PDMF, leads to a double-peaked IMF. Furthermore, note that the bimodality has a suspicious onset. The high mass, power law trend turns over at $m \sim 1.4M_{\odot}$, precisely the mass where $\tau(m) \sim \text{Gyr}$ becomes comparable to the shortest (high- z) input timescales. That is, the departure from smoothness happens abruptly, and at a mass scale that is neither expected to be special, nor seen to be remarkable in the PDMF data, and is likely to be an artifact of the input star formation rate.

To give a rough sense of the departure from unimodality, we fit the IMF of Figure 1(a) to the simplest nonlinear unimodal form, a lognormal (i.e., quadratic in $\log \phi$ versus $\log m$). We find the best quadratic fit by minimization of χ^2 ; results appear in the upper panel of Figure 2. For this plot, we have computed the formal reduced χ^2 for the $\log \phi - \log \phi_{\text{fit}}$ data versus the fit curve. We find $\chi^2_{\nu} = 0.40$, which is quite small. Nominally, this would indicate a good fit—indeed, it suggests that the errors are overestimated. However, this is not the whole story, as the χ^2_{ν} value alone only quantifies how well the ensemble of points fits the curve; it is silent as to the distribution of points about the curve. In fact, it is clear from the figure that the errors are not distributed about the best-fit curve in a random fashion. Instead, the data for the most part lie quite comfortably within the curve—except around $m \sim 2M_{\odot}$, where the data systematically rises and then falls. For the underlying IMF to be unimodal and lie on the curve requires a systematic conspiracy of

errors right around $m \sim 2M_\odot$ to counter the departures seen in Figure 2(b). We therefore view the IMF’s systematic departure from smoothness as quite suggestive, if not yet definitive.

Thus we see that the IMF required by star formation universality is probably not unimodal. This is the main result of this paper, with significant implications. Namely, we are led to conclude that either: (1) our calculation is correct, and the universal IMF has this form, contrary to observational evidence, theoretical prejudice, and common usage, which favor a smoother form, either unimodal or power law; (2) our calculation is incorrect because the IMF is not constant in time, again contrary to common assumptions; or (3) our calculation is incorrect because star formation universality does not hold—the Galactic star formation rate is not representative of the cosmos. Thus, the simplest assumptions about the IMF are inconsistent with the simplest ansatz about the local–cosmic star formation connection.

Our calculation does not tell which of these possibilities is the right one; in the final section we discuss further tests to address this issue. One implication is worth noting here: if the IMF indeed varies with time, it must be top-heavy—i.e., biased towards high masses—at early times. This follows from the mismatch between the high- and low-mass regions of the IMF. The low mass end is overly suppressed because the integrated star formation $\Sigma_\star(t_0)$ is high, and $\phi \propto \Sigma_\star(t_0)^{-1}$ in this mass range. A top-heavy early IMF reduces this suppression by reducing the high-redshift contribution to $\Sigma_\star(t_0)$ in low mass stars. It is interesting to note that IMFs of this character have been discussed in the literature; see Cassé, Olive, Vangioni-Flam, & Audouze (1998) and references therein.

The uncertainties in the IMF of Figure 1 arise in part from the input PDMF, but more importantly from the (as yet) poorly known nature of cosmic star formation (cf. §3). In Figure 3, we compare the IMF of Figure 1 with one derived from the Madau “evolving E_{B-V} ” scenario. Here we see that the bimodality is even stronger, a consequence of this scenario’s higher star formation at early epochs. The open squares of figure 3 show the IMF resulting from using a “truncated” CSFR, which we take to be the Madau CSFR for $z < 1$, and zero for $z \geq 1$. By comparing the IMF resulting from this CSFR with the IMFs from the other two, we see the pivotal role of the evolution in the uncertain $z \geq 1$ regime. With the truncated CSFR, the IMF is now completely consistent with being unimodal; we thus infer that the high-redshift behavior is crucial in forcing a bimodal IMF and the consequences thereby implied. Improved determination of the CSFR in this redshift range will thus sharpen our test.

For comparison, we have also considered the alternate test for PDMF–star formation history compatibility, in which one assumes a particular form of the IMF as well as the LSFR. If the IMF were “known,” it would make for a different and more decisive test of star formation universality: one derives the (fully determined) PDMF according to eq. (4), and compares it directly to the data. Such tests are routinely performed in chemical evolution models (see Pagel 1997); here, however, we do not require an *ad hoc* form of the LSFR, but rather star formation universality.

We will examine two commonly used IMF functional forms: (1) a power law, $\phi(m) \propto m^{-x}$,

with $x = 2.35$ (Salpeter 1955); and (2) a lognormal $\phi \propto m^{-1} \exp[-\ln^2(m/m_c)/2\sigma^2]$, with $m_c = 0.087M_\odot$, $\sigma = 1.6$ (Miller & Scalo 1979). These forms have some support from work on the theory of the IMF (Adams & Fatuzzo 1996; Silk 1995). However, we caution that these “standard” IMFs have arisen because they provide good fits to the PDMF given various *assumed*, mildly varying LSFR trends. That is, these IMFs were not derived to allow for strongly variable star formation, as is observed in the CSFR. Nevertheless, we include them here for comparison.

Our results appear in Figures 4 and 5. We fix the derived PDMF to the data by adjusting the (arbitrary) normalization to minimize the χ^2 of the fit to the data. We see that when one adopts either the Salpeter or the Miller-Scalo IMF, the derived PDMF fails to agree with the data at low ($m \lesssim 0.2M_\odot$) and intermediate ($m \sim 2M_\odot$) masses. The discrepancy below $0.2M_\odot$ arises due to the high star formation at early times, which leads to a large integrated star formation $\Sigma_\star(t_0)$, and in turn a high $\Phi_{\text{MS}} \propto \Sigma_\star(t_0)$ at $m < m_0$. The discrepancy around $2M_\odot$ arises for similar reasons as the IMF bimodality seen in Figures 1–3, discussed above. Indeed, this behavior is as expected: we have adopted a time-independent, unimodal IMF, so we should not expect the LSFR to trace the cosmic mean.

5. Which Local Star Formation History?

In considering whether the our local star formation history is representative of the cosmic mean, one should be clear about the possible distinctions between the solar neighborhood, Galactic, and cosmic star formation histories. As noted in §1, the PDMF encodes only star formation in the disk (Population I), and omits halo (Population II) star formation. Furthermore, the dynamics and composition of the halo stars strongly suggests that they were formed prior to most disk stars, so that their contribution to the Galactic star formation rate (globally and locally) changes the overall *shape* of the time history. Consequently, the “local” star formation history sampled by the PDMF is necessarily an incomplete account of the Galactic star formation history. Thus, halo star formation at early epochs probably contributes to the CSFR, but not to the PDMF, and could thus be responsible for part of the bimodality seen in Figures 1 and 3.

We can estimate the effect of halo star formation as follows. As we have seen, the discontinuity in the derived IMF arises because the low-mass ($m \leq m_0 \sim 0.9M_\odot$) points suffer a large correction, because their cumulative number includes all star formation epochs, including the earliest ones. Specifically, eq. (8) shows that for low mass stars, $\phi \propto \Sigma_\star(t_0)^{-1}$, that is, the suppression is inversely proportional to the *total*, integrated star formation. In our test, we obtained $\Sigma_\star$ from the CSFR, which in some sense represents the average galactic star formation rate. But even if the Galaxy were representative of the average, the disk PDMF does not include the halo star formation. Thus, one should correct the CSFR contribution to omit halo star production. While this is at present impossible to do in detail, we can estimate the magnitude of the correction as follows. The key point is that the low-mass correction is controlled by the net star formation $\Sigma_\star$. Viewed from a Galactic scale, this is (up to a factor) the total stellar mass today. But the halo

star contribution to the Galactic stellar mass is small, very probably $\lesssim 10 - 20\%$ of the total, with the disk providing the dominant contribution. Thus, correcting for halo star formation will raise the low mass points in Figures 1 and 3 by at most a factor of 1.25 (i.e., 0.1 dex in the log). It is thus unlikely that Population II star formation contributes significantly to the bimodality seen in the previous section.

Another issue one should bear in mind is that the “local” star formation information we have used is that of the PDMF and thus samples only the solar neighborhood. It is of course possible that the shape of the solar neighborhood star formation rate cannot be simply related to the spatial mean over the disk e.g., $\psi_{\odot}(t)/\psi_{\text{disk}}(t) \neq \text{const.}$ However, if the shape of $\psi_{\odot}(t)$ is drastically different from that of $\psi_{\text{disk}}(t)$, this is a problem that plagues not only the present discussion, but many models of Galactic chemical evolution. In this case, the number of required parameters becomes large, and the strength of available constraints is thus diluted.

6. Conclusions

It is both simple and conventional to assume that the Galaxy’s star formation history:

1. is typical of the universal average (i.e., $\psi \propto \dot{\rho}_{\star}$),
2. has an IMF that is constant in time, and
3. has an IMF that is smooth, i.e., unimodal.

In this paper, we have tested the compatibility of these assumptions. We used the observed PDMF to derive the IMF implied by star formation universality and IMF constancy (i.e., assumptions 1 and 2). The resulting IMF is consistent with unimodal in a formal statistical sense, but shows clear signs of bimodality, with a low mass peak at $m \sim 0.2M_{\odot}$, and a second peak around $m \sim 1.3M_{\odot}$ which we suspect is unphysical. If the apparent bimodality persists and is strengthened as the data improve, then the IMF is not in accord with assumption 3, and we conclude that one of the three premises is false.

Which assumption fails? If star formation universality does not hold, it could be for many reasons. For example, the disk star formation history could differ from the full Galactic history (i.e., there may have been much star formation in halo, as discussed in §5). Or it could well be that the CSFR is dominated, at least at high-redshift, by galaxies with a very different history than our own. Alternatively, it is possible that our Galaxy’s evolution was typical, and one *can* use the CSFR for Galactic evolution purposes

If the Galaxy’s star formation is indeed representative, then one of our other two assumptions must fail. For example, the IMF could be a time-varying, and biased towards high masses at early

epochs; this is certainly possible but not conventional. Or it is possible that the universal IMF is indeed bimodal, as in Figure 1. However, for our purposes it is not encouraging that there is no hint of bimodality in the PDMF, and it is perhaps suspicious that the bimodality in the IMF we derive sets in just at the range of masses where the IMF-PDMF transformation is nontrivial.

The test we have described can be considerably sharpened as the observations, both cosmic and local, improve. Most importantly, a better understanding of extinction properties at high redshift will help nail down the CSFR. The PDMF errors are large, could also be improved with additional data over the whole mass range, but particularly in the region where the bimodality of Figure 1 appears, i.e., $m \simeq 0.8 - 2M_{\odot}$, corresponding to A, F, and G stars. Indeed, to our knowledge the PDMF has not been revisited since Scalo (1986); a full re-analysis would be of great usefulness.

Other observations and analyses can help to determine which assumptions hold and which do not. Regarding the IMF, there is observational evidence, in elemental ratios, that the IMF does not vary much in space and time (at least at the high mass end, Wyse 1998). Direct determination of the IMF in local star forming regions is difficult; it is nevertheless tantalizing that a recent analysis of the stellar population of the Orion Trapezium (Hillenbrand 1997) has found a mass function broadly consistent with a Miller-Scalo (1979) form, showing no bimodality. Further tests of cosmic star formation are also possible, e.g., using the CSFR to reproduce the classic chemical evolution results for various systems and epochs (Fall & Pei 1995; Cassé, Olive, Vangioni-Flam, & Audouze 1998). Finally, it is of great interest to use local observables to infer the Galactic star formation history. One such method combines the local data on the G-dwarf and age-metallicity distributions (e.g. Rocha-Pinto & Maciel 1997, and references therein). This technique remains uncertain due to the difficulties in obtaining an accurate age-metallicity relation, particularly for large ages. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the derived LSFR, while increasing towards the past, may not show as strong an increase as the cosmic rate at early epochs. Clearly, new and improved tracers of the LSFR would be useful.

Finally, the most likely conclusion is perhaps that the Milky Way is not typical of the average galaxy over all epochs. If so, it would be interesting to determine if the Milky Way evolution is at least typical of all spiral galaxies. In any case, we already see hints that the simplest of all possible worlds—in which assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold—is not the one we live in. Chemical evolutionists take note.

I am pleased to acknowledge useful conversations with Dave Graff, Katie Freese, Grant Mathews, Keith Olive, and Evan Skillman. I thank the anonymous referee, and the editor Steve Shore, for helpful suggestions which improved this paper. This work was supported in part by DoE grant DE-FG02-94ER-40823.

REFERENCES

- Adams, F.C., & Fatuzzo, M. 1996, *ApJ*, 464, 256
- Baugh, C.M., Cole, S., Frenk, C.S., & Lacey, C.G. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 504
- Cassé, M., Olive, K.A., Vangioni-Flam, E., & Audouze, J. 1998, *New Astron.*, 3, 259
- Connolly, A.J., Szalay, A.S., Dickinson, M., SubbaRao, M.U., & Brunner, R.J. 1997, *ApJ*, 486, L11
- Elbaz, D., Arnould, M., & Vangioni-Flam, E. 1995, *A&A*, 303, 345
- Fall, S.M., & Pei, Y.C. 1995, *ApJ*, 454, 69
- Ferrini, F., Palla, F., & Penco, U. 1990, *A&A*, 231, 391
- Gallego, J., Zamorano, J., Aragon-Salamanca, A., & Rego, M. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, L1
- Gibson, B.K. 1996, *MNRAS*, 278, 829
- Gusten, R., & Mezger, P.G. 1982, *Vistas Astron.*, 26, 159
- Herbig, G.H. 1962, *Adv. Astron. Astrophys.*, 1, 47
- Hillenbrand, L.A. 1997, *AJ*, 113, 1733
- Kennicutt, R.C. 1983, *ApJ*, 272, 54
- Larson, R.B. 1986, *MNRAS*, 218, 409
- Lilly, S.J., Le Fèvre, O., Hammer, F., & Crampton, D. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, L1
- Madau, P., et al. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 1388
- Madau, P. 1997a, in *Star Formation Near and Far*, ed. S.S. Holt & G.L. Mundy (AIP: New York), 481
- . 1997b, Review Presented at the 1997 7th International Origins Conference, Estes Park, CO (astro-ph/9707141)
- Mathews, G.J., Bazan, G., & Cowan, J.J. 1992, *ApJ*, 391, 719
- Meurer, G.R., et al. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 2665
- Miller, G.E., & Scalo, J.M. 1979, *ApJS*, 41, 513
- Pagel, B.E.J. 1997, *Nucleosynthesis and Chemical Evolution of Galaxies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

- Pettini, M., et al. 1997, in *The Ultraviolet Universe at Low and High Redshift*, ed. W. Waller, (Woodbury: AIP Press), in press (astro-ph/9707200)
- Rocha-Pinto, H.J., & Maciel, W.J. 1997, *MNRAS*, 289, 882
- Salpeter, E.E. 1955, *ApJ*, 121, 161
- Scalo, J.M. 1986, *Fund. Cosmic Phys.*, 11, 1
- Shore, S., & Ferrini, F. 1995, *Fund. Cosmic Phys.*, 16, 1
- Silk, J. 1995, *ApJ*, 438, L41
- Tinsley, B. 1980, *Fund. Cosmic Phys.*, 5, 287
- Tresse, L., & Maddox, S.J. 1997, *ApJ*, 495, 691
- Wyse, R.F.G. 1998, in *The Stellar IMF, Proceedings of the 38th Herstmonceux Conference*, ed. G. Gilmore et al. (ASP Conference series), in press
- Wyse, R.F.G., & Silk, J. 1987, *ApJ*, 313, L11

Figure Captions

1. The IMF derived from the PDMF of Scalo (1986) and the Madau fiducial, “constant E_{B-V} ” CSFR (*inset*). IMF units are arbitrary.
2. (a) The IMF of Figure 1, fit to a lognormal via χ^2 minimization.
 (b) The residuals (i.e., $\log \phi - \log \phi_{\text{fit}}$) of panel (a). The discontinuity in the $1 - 2 M_{\odot}$ range suggests that the points in this range do not vary randomly but instead show to a real departure from the simple unimodal fit.
3. The IMF plotted as in Fig. 1 for different CSFR forms, as noted in the inset. *Filled circles*: fiducial Madau CSFR of Fig. 1; *open triangles*: “evolving E_{B-V} ” Madau CSFR ; *open squares*: “truncated” Madau CSFR. Errorbars have been suppressed for clarity.
4. The PDMF, plotted as $m\Phi_{\text{MS}}(m)$; *filled circles*: observational data are from Scalo (1986). The PDMF is derived using the Madau CSFR models as indicated in the inset and assuming an IMF of the Salpeter (1955) power law form, $\phi(m) \propto m^{-2.35}$.
5. The PDMF as in Figure 4, assuming an IMF of the Miller-Scalo (1979) lognormal form.









